

BACK TO PRABHUPĀDA


The Magazine of the Real Hare Kṛṣṇa Movement

Issue 73, Vol. 2, 2022

"Defeating Tyranny in the Realm of Thought"

www.iskconirm.com

The Death of ISKCON India's Credibility



Also in this issue:

**Only Prabhupāda's
Words Count**


**GBC Gurus Unable
to Remove Sins**

**ISKCON R̥tvik to
Illegal Guru**

**Guru Defeats
Himself**



ISKCON Revival Movement



BACK TO PRABHUPĀDA

Published quarterly

Founded under the inspiration of **His Divine Grace A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda**, Founder-Ācārya, International Society for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness (ISKCON)

Editor: Krishnakant

Changing address?

Don't miss out on your free subscription to *BTP*! Contact us as below to update your address – or if you wish to unsubscribe.

For more information, and letters to the editor, please write to:

Back To Prabhupāda
PO Box 1056, BUSHEY
GREAT BRITAIN, WD23 3BR

or email:

irm@iskconirm.com

website:

www.iskconirm.com

Want to receive *BTP* but don't want anyone to see or know? Then ask for your subscription to be sent in a plain, unmarked envelope. This confidential service is offered free of charge. Simply let us know. And tell potential subscribers about this service too.

Contents	Page
Śrīla Prabhupāda v. GBC Gurus	3
Guru Claims Guruship Requires No Order	4
Only Śrīla Prabhupāda's Words Count	5
Śrīla Prabhupāda Inspires Full Surrender	6
GBC Guru Does Not Give <i>Dikṣā</i> ..	7
Failure of IISB's "Scholars"	8
<i>BTP</i> Interactive	10
Guru's Self-Defeat by "Śāstra"	14
From <i>ṛtvik</i> to Illegal Guru	15
Śrīla Prabhupāda Is Not a Liar...	16

Reality v. Fantasy

Welcome to Issue 73 of *Back To Prabhupāda* (*BTP*).

During a discussion on the "*ṛtvik* issue" (the movement to restore Śrīla Prabhupāda to his original position as ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru) between GBC Strategic Planning Team members **Pancharatna Dāsa** ("PRD") and **Kaunteya Dāsa** ("KTD"), amazement was expressed at how anyone could still believe that Śrīla Prabhupāda remains ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru. Thus, KTD stated (all quotes in shaded boxes are from this discussion held on 13/12/21):

"frankly, I personally find this surprising that there are still people in the world, there are still pockets of devotees in the world that somehow, they still believe in this."

However, the reasons for such amazement are even more amazing, being based on fantasy.

1) KTD states that, when referring to "*ṛtviks*" who would be appointed to initiate on his behalf in India, Śrīla Prabhupāda remarks, "*I am in India*". KTD claims this remark (the correct quote is actually "*India I am here*" - Room Conversation, 7/7/77) proves:

"they were talking about a time when Śrīla Prabhupāda was present. We are not talking about something forever or after he left."

Yes, we *are* talking about a time when Śrīla Prabhupāda was physically present. Because the *ṛtvik* system was to start operating almost immediately just 2 days after this "*India I am here*" comment by Śrīla Prabhupāda, *whilst* he was physically present. But, it has never been disputed that the *ṛtvik* system was to *begin* in Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical presence. The issue is was the system to be *terminated* at the end of Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical presence? Thus, the "*India I am here*" quote mentioned by KTD only tells us when the system was to *start*. It does not tell us when it was to *end*. Thus, Śrīla Prabhupāda referring to when the *ṛtvik* system was to *begin* has zero relevance to when it was to be terminated. For that, we would need to seek out Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions referring to the system's termination. But there exists no such termination instruction, which means it was not to be terminated.

2) PRD states the GBC can't accept that Śrīla

Prabhupāda remains ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru because:

"how is it possible that Śrīla Prabhupāda would nullify everything that he has said up to that point about his disciples initiating their own disciples."

Only, Śrīla Prabhupāda has not stated that his disciples will initiate their own disciples. Please note the 3 underlined words and you will see that there is no order from Śrīla Prabhupāda which includes those 3 elements. Hence, there is nothing, not "everything", that Śrīla Prabhupāda would have to "nullify" if he continued to remain ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru.

3) Anyone who reads *BTP* will note that ISKCON leaders rarely quote us directly, relying instead on made-up "straw-man" arguments regarding what we *supposedly* state. Thus, they are not even fully aware of what our position actually is. And the previous point shows how ISKCON's leaders are not even properly aware of the facts regarding their *own* arguments that they present. Whereas, as our *BTP* articles show, when we reference the other side's arguments, we always quote ISKCON leaders verbatim and respond to exactly what they state. Hence, whilst we are fully acquainted with both sides of the argument, the other side is not fully acquainted with either side of the argument!

Therefore, it is not surprising that ISKCON leaders may find it "surprising" that there are many devotees who accept that Śrīla Prabhupāda remains ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru, when ISKCON leaders' understanding of the situation is based on fantasy rather than facts. Those who live in fantasy will always find reality surprising. In *BTP* 17 (see "GBC Bombshell: 'We have no guru order'"), we documented the admission that the ISKCON guru system is based on mind reading rather than orders from Śrīla Prabhupāda. And, hence, just like the guru hoax supporters' view of our position, *BTP* readers also find it "surprising" that "there are still people in the world, that somehow they still believe in this" (the guru hoax). The difference, however, is that only we are living in reality.

Thank you and Hare Kṛṣṇa.

In Śrīla Prabhupāda's service,

Krishnakant

IRM Mission Statement

Since the physical departure of His Divine Grace A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Śrīla Prabhupāda from our material vision on November 14, 1977, the International Society for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness (ISKCON), the great movement that he single-handedly founded in 1966, and which is the only hope for humanity, has undergone a massive deterioration in its spiritual purity. This has been due to various deviations from the instructions and standards given by Śrīla Prabhupāda, the chief of which being his displacement as the sole *dikṣā* guru for ISKCON. The ISKCON Revival Movement (IRM) seeks to restore ISKCON to its former glory, purity and philosophical chastity through the re-institution of all the instructions and standards that Śrīla Prabhupāda gave, beginning with his role as the sole authority and *dikṣā* guru for ISKCON. The IRM's position is set out in *The Final Order* – see back page to order your free copy.

Śrīla Prabhupāda v. GBC Gurus

GBC voted-in guru **HH Badrinārāyan Swami** (“**BAD**”) claims that by having a GBC voted-in *dikṣā* guru, one gets “the best of both worlds”:

“grand disciples of Śrīla Prabhupāda have both blessings, they have the blessings of their physically present spiritual master [...] they also have a connection with Prabhupāda, so it’s the best of both worlds.”

(BAD Morning Class, 5/12/21)

And, hence, such people have at least the same as what the “*ṛtviks*” (the IRM) have:

*“Whatever the *ṛtviks* say they have, you also have. [...] ‘Well, I’m not really connected to Prabhupāda [...] I got this second rate guy’ [...] they’ve been brainwashed to think that they’re not getting Prabhupāda’s mercy, they’re making an either/or choice.”*

(BAD Morning Class, 5/12/21)

Let us check what Śrīla Prabhupāda states. All emphases added.

Self-defeated

In the same lecture, BAD states that for a disciple, a physically present guru is needed as he is someone who:

“can keep them off the mental platform and keep them in line and who they can ask immediate questions and get immediate answers”

But BAD himself does not have this facility, since, like the “*ṛtviks*” he condemns, he ‘only’ has Śrīla Prabhupāda as his guru, and thus has not had a “physically present” guru for 45 years! So BAD’s proposal fails at the very first hurdle due to self-contradiction and hypocrisy as he himself is not practising what he insists others must practise. Indeed, if a “physically present” guru is required, then Śrīla Prabhupāda would have taught that:

‘As soon as I physically depart, all my disciples must get “re-initiated”, or accept another “physically present” guru.’

However, not only did he *not* teach this, he actually taught the opposite:

“So we should associate by the vibration, and not by the physical presence. That is real association.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 18/8/68)

What’s the order?

The most important question that needs to be answered is what did Śrīla Prabhupāda order? Because, if he did *not* order successor *dikṣā* gurus for ISKCON, but rather ordered that he remain the sole *dikṣā* guru, then:

1) Any GBC voted-in *dikṣā* guru would be

disobeying Śrīla Prabhupāda, and thus would not be a guru but an unauthorised fraudster who has no standing in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, let alone as a ‘good as God’ *dikṣā* guru:

“If one is disobeying the spiritual master, he cannot remain in the pure status of life. He cannot be *śikṣā*-guru or anything else. He is finished, immediately.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 4/7/74)

2) By accepting such a disobedient person as one’s guru, his disciple would be part of this offensive disobedience to Śrīla Prabhupāda, and thus cannot result in the disciple receiving Śrīla Prabhupāda’s mercy. Rather, it can only be severely *detrimental* to one’s spiritual life:


“If he displeases Kṛṣṇa’s representative he has no entrance to the Kṛṣṇa’s kingdom, [...] Immediately rejected. [...] Disobedient... “Obedience is first discipline.” So if Kṛṣṇa’s representative is disobeyed – “Get out immediately.” Kṛṣṇa is very strict.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda, Room Conversation, 12/12/70)

Therefore, if one disobeys Śrīla Prabhupāda, then, rather than getting his mercy, one is immediately rejected. Hence, before accepting a GBC guru as one’s *dikṣā* guru, one would need to first confirm that the GBC guru was authorised by Śrīla Prabhupāda to replace him. For only then could accepting the GBC guru possibly result in being the “best of both worlds” and ‘double mercy’. But, as we have copiously documented throughout all of our IRM literature, no successor *dikṣā* gurus were authorised by Śrīla Prabhupāda. Thus, BAD’s claim that one would still be connected to, and getting, Śrīla Prabhupāda’s mercy, by accepting successor GBC gurus is untrue. Rather, one would be cut off from Śrīla Prabhupāda. Thus, far from ‘doubling the mercy’, one would now be getting no mercy at all, either from Śrīla Prabhupāda or the GBC guru who is just a fraudster.

Zero sum reality

1) Every person only has a fixed, limited amount of time in their lives. Therefore, if one has accepted a physically present GBC guru, every second that one spends worshipping/reading/listening to this physical guru is one less second spent on focusing on Śrīla Prabhupāda. Hence, we reported in the BTP 68 ‘QNN’ article “The 40% Guru”, how GBC voted-in guru **HH Śivārāma Swami** had developed a “40%” theory, that since one must listen to one’s physically present GBC guru, one



Śrīla Prabhupāda:
GBC gurus take us away from him

can only end up listening to Śrīla Prabhupāda 40% of the time.

2) It is our philosophy that the *dikṣā* guru is supposed to be treated as everything, or like God, for the disciple:

“The murti of the spiritual master should be treated as good as the Deity [...] The guru should be treated as good as God. This is stated in all the sastras.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter, 29/1/76)

This has been acknowledged by numerous ISKCON leaders, such as GBC member **Praghoṣa Dāsa** who stated that having a GBC guru poses a “problem” because it causes GBC guru followers to divert their attention away from Śrīla Prabhupāda due to focusing on their GBC gurus:

*“It’s natural that devotees, second generation, third generation devotees, it’s natural that they will have deep appreciation, respect, love, and all of those things for their *dikṣā* guru [...] So that in one sense is natural [...] this is the problem, we cannot have gurus taking such a significant role that they become the be all and end all in the lives of devotees.”*

(Praghoṣa Dāsa Interview, 18/11/20)

In addition to diverting one’s time away from Śrīla Prabhupāda, the GBC guru will also shift one away from Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings towards whatever one’s GBC guru happens to teach, because, naturally, the disciple is supposed to accept and follow whatever his spiritual master says. And, we have documented in BTP the GBC gurus teaching differently from Śrīla Prabhupāda (and even from what their own fellow GBC guru colleagues teach!).

Conclusion

BAD’s claim that the GBC guru improves one’s spiritual situation is defeated by the facts. The GBC guru actually disconnects us from Śrīla Prabhupāda – both spiritually and also practically.

GBC Guru Claims Guruship Needs No Order

In a recent lecture given on 4/5/22, GBC voted-in guru **HH Jayādvaita Swami** (“JAS”) discussed the authority required to become a *dikṣā* guru. The quotes in shaded boxes are taken from this lecture. All emphases added.

We need an order

“There’s a section of people who have made a big point that in order to become a representative of Śrīla Prabhupāda and initiate disciples, one must have received the order to do so”

JAS here refers to the IRM who repeat Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings that in order to become a *dikṣā* guru (“initiate disciples”) one must have been ordered to do so by his guru:

“A guru can become guru when he’s ordered by his guru. That’s all. Otherwise nobody can become guru.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 28/10/75)

We don’t need an order

However, JAS then continues on to claim:

“but they fail to observe that Śrīla Prabhupāda ordered everyone to spread Kṛṣṇa consciousness, this Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement, and never indicated that there was to be some sort of specific order.”

JAS thus claims:

a) That Śrīla Prabhupāda’s order to preach suffices as an order to be a *dikṣā* guru;

b) because Śrīla Prabhupāda never stated there should be a “specific” *dikṣā* guru order.

Hence, JAS is claiming that to become a *dikṣā* guru does not even require an order to be a *dikṣā* guru, since the order to preach is already given. However:

1) It is possible to preach without needing to become a *dikṣā* guru, and thus the latter is not an automatic or necessary consequence of the former.

2) Śrīla Prabhupāda’s order to preach is clearly not also an order to become a *dikṣā* guru, since he clearly states that it does not require one to have any qualifications, such that even a child can do it:

“No qualification required. [...] Anyone can do it, even a child. [laughs] Our Śyāmasundara’s daughter. She was preaching, “Do you know Kṛṣṇa?” [...] Even a child like Sarasvatī, she can preach. [...] But these three words, that “Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Lord; you are servant; and chant Hare Kṛṣṇa” [...] Everyone can become guru by simply teaching these three words.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda, Room Conversation, 26/1/77)

Whereas, to become a *dikṣā* guru does require one to be very qualified, at the very least to be self-realised, or liberated:

“Just try to learn the truth by approaching a spiritual master. Inquire from him submissively and render service unto him. The self-realized soul can impart knowledge unto you because he has seen the truth.”

(Bg., 4.34)

Even in JAS’s “edited” *Bhagavad-gītā*, this verse states that the spiritual master must be self-realised.

3) JAS himself does not believe that just the order to preach means that one is authorised to become a *dikṣā* guru. For he only became a *dikṣā* guru after being authorised to become a *dikṣā* guru by receiving the required votes from the GBC. He also only allowed his own disciple, **HH Kadamba Kānana Swami** (“KKS”), to act as a *dikṣā* guru after KKS had also first been authorised by the GBC! If JAS believed that the order to preach was sufficient authority to become a *dikṣā* guru, then JAS would have acted on it and become a *dikṣā* guru. But he did not, as he accepted that authorisation to be a *dikṣā* guru was still required.

Order means specific


JAS’s claim that Śrīla Prabhupāda never stated that there needs to be a “specific order” to be a *dikṣā* guru can also be easily rebutted:

If the order for one action – preach – can be taken to mean something else – “become *dikṣā* guru” – then the concept of an “order” becomes meaningless, since you are not actually following the order given, but your own made-up version of the order. If the guru orders, “Give me milk”, but you take it to mean to also cook him a feast, then you are not following the order the guru gave, but your own version of the order. Hence, it is stated that:

“The order of the spiritual master is the active principle in spiritual life. [...] Persons who strictly follow the orders of the spiritual master are useful in executing the will of the Supreme”

(Cc., Ādi-līlā, 12.10, verse and purport)

Thus, only by the order of the spiritual master can one be “active” or act. But then we can only act by following that order “strictly”, which would mean that we cannot add to or subtract from this order. Thus, “order” means, by definition, a “specific” order, otherwise one could just concoct whatever one wanted the order to mean, and not be “strictly” following



Śrīla Prabhupāda: His teachings defeat GBC’s guru concoctions

the actual order given.

Example proof

To illustrate the point just made, Śrīla Prabhupāda states:

“Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Thākura, at the time of his departure, requested all his disciples to form a governing body and conduct missionary activities cooperatively. He did not instruct a particular man to become the next ācārya. But just after his passing away, his leading secretaries made plans, without authority, to occupy the post of ācārya, and they split in two factions over who the next ācārya would be. Consequently, both factions were asāra, or useless, because they had no authority, having disobeyed the order of the spiritual master.”

(Cc., Ādi-līlā, 12.8, purport)

Here, Śrīla Prabhupāda explains that:

a) Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Thākura had given an order to “preach” – “conduct missionary activities”;

b) But he had *not* given a *specific* order for a person to be the next ācārya;

c) Therefore, those who went on to become ācārya had disobeyed the actual order of the guru to preach.

This proves that:

i) The order to preach means *only* that – to preach;

ii) Therefore, to become an ācārya, or *dikṣā* guru, would require a specific order for that.

Conclusion

Due to there *not* being an order from Śrīla Prabhupāda for anyone in ISKCON to become a *dikṣā* guru, JAS has tried to get around this lack of an order by concocting that one does not even need such an order. However, this concoction has easily been defeated by both Śrīla Prabhupāda and JAS himself.

Only Śrīla Prabhupāda's Words Count

GBC voted-in guru **Mahātmā Dāsa** ("MAD") was challenged on social media regarding his unauthorised *dikṣā* guru position. His responses to this challenge were given on 6/3/22 and 11/3/22, and are in the shaded boxes below. Emphases added.

No evidence from Śrīla Prabhupāda

"I have spoken to numerous devotees that were present when Prabhupāda gave his instructions, that from *ritviks* they would go, and after his departure they would be gurus. So, for the reform movement, they are sincere devotees but ill-informed. None of them were there. [...] The people who were there affirmed it."

1) Śrīla Prabhupāda was also present when he gave his instructions. And it is only his words that matter – not the claims of others.

2) Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions were recorded, and so the world can know what they were. Hence, we do not need to rely on others who were there to know what Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions were – we can just hear or read them directly from Śrīla Prabhupāda. These recorded instructions from Śrīla Prabhupāda are presented in every *BTP* issue, *The Final Order* and our other books and papers.

3) And Śrīla Prabhupāda did not affirm that the "*ṛtviks*" would turn into *dikṣā* gurus. If Śrīla Prabhupāda had actually stated this, then MAD would be able to produce Śrīla Prabhupāda stating this. But MAD does not. Rather, very tellingly, lacking this evidence, MAD is instead forced to rely on claiming he has spoken to others, and that these others have merely claimed that Śrīla Prabhupāda states this. The reality however, as proven by his directly recorded words, is that Śrīla Prabhupāda only stated that the "*ṛtviks*" would be *ṛtviks*!

Not clear at all

"I have spoken to numerous devotees that were present when Prabhupāda gave his instructions [...] Everyone who was there, to them, what Prabhupāda said was clear that Prabhupāda had appointed 11 devotees to initiate on his behalf, who would then become gurus, and then that number would expand."

MAD states that at the time when Śrīla Prabhupāda gave his instructions for how initiations would continue in ISKCON, "everyone" who was there understood that Śrīla Prabhupāda ordered two things:

1) the 11 devotees appointed to initiate on Śrīla Prabhupāda's behalf ("*ṛtviks*") should

automatically turn into *dikṣā* gurus on Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical departure;

2) the number of *dikṣā* gurus should be expanded from these 11.

However, in regards to point 1), one of those present when Śrīla Prabhupāda gave his instructions and also one of the original "11 devotees" appointed, **HH Tamāla Kṛṣṇa Goswami** ("TKG"), stated just 3 years after the instructions were given that it was a huge mistake to interpret the appointment of 11 *ṛtviks* as the appointment of those who should also become *dikṣā* gurus:

"Actually Prabhupāda never appointed any gurus. He appointed eleven *ṛtviks*. [...] Myself and the other GBC have done the greatest disservice to this movement the last three years because we interpreted the appointment of *ṛtviks* as the appointment of gurus."

(TKG, GBC and Guru, Topanga Canyon, 3/12/80)

Not clear at all - 2

In regards to point 2) from the previous section, **Satsvarūpa Dāsa** was also present when Śrīla Prabhupāda gave his instructions, and he was also another one of the original "11 devotees" appointed. And both he and TKG stated that the leaders who were there at the time insisted that Śrīla Prabhupāda only appointed those specific eleven people to be *dikṣā* gurus, and not that the number should "expand":


"Unfortunately, the GBC did not recognize this point. They immediately supposed these eleven people are the selected gurus. I can definitely say for myself, and for which I humbly beg forgiveness from everybody, that there was definitely some degree of trying to control [...] This is the conditioned nature, and it came out in the highest position of all, 'Guru, oh wonderful! Now I'm a guru, and there is only eleven of us'"

(TKG, GBC and guru, Topanga Canyon, 3/12/80)

"In 1978, the concept began that only eleven persons should be initiating ācāryas. [...] I was not the one to see a defect in the procedures"

(Satsvarūpa Dāsa, "ISKCON in the 1970s")

Consequently, it was only a decade later that the devotees who were there when Śrīla Prabhupāda gave this instruction reversed their stance to approve the general expansion of gurus from the original eleven. Indeed, the GBC has repeatedly flip-flopped on its position regarding *guru-tattva* since 1977 – see for example the *BTP* 64 article "The GBC's 10 Contradictory Guru Systems" for evidence of this.



MAD (L): Relying on discredited testimony instead of Śrīla Prabhupāda's words

Thus, it is just an historical fact that the two points claimed by MAD as being "clear" to "everyone" were not actually "clear" at all to "everyone" at the time.

Abandoning order

"The fact is, according to *śāstra*, that the *ritvik* who does the initiation is actually the *dikṣā* guru of the devotees being initiated because one cannot initiate on behalf of a deceased guru"

But MAD presents no evidence that "*śāstra*" states that "one cannot initiate on behalf of a deceased guru", and thus his claims have no value, being nothing more than MAD's unsubstantiated allegations.

"there's nothing in Prabhupāda's books about initiation by proxy of a guru who has passed away. So the *ritvik* idea is neither supported by Prabhupāda's direct words nor supported by *shastra*"

There is also 'nothing in Prabhupāda's books about initiation by a guru who has passed his 70th birthday' either! But he can initiate! Because the books *do* state that the spiritual master can initiate disciples, but they do not then add that the spiritual master is forbidden from initiating due to *material* restrictions, whatever they may be. Thus, Śrīla Prabhupāda initiated disciples in ISKCON via his July 9th, 1977, directive – which he signed – which stated that ISKCON should follow the *ṛtvik* system of initiation. Therefore, Śrīla Prabhupāda initiating in ISKCON in this way without restriction is supported by Śrīla Prabhupāda's books and order.

Conclusion

Due to *not* having an order from Śrīla Prabhupāda for the 11 *ṛtviks* to turn into *dikṣā* gurus, MAD has tried to get around this lack of an order by claiming that we can instead just rely on the claims of others. But we follow Śrīla Prabhupāda by following Śrīla Prabhupāda – not anyone else!

Śrīla Prabhupāda Inspires Full Surrender

Śrīla Prabhupāda explained that the disciple must surrender fully to his spiritual master:

"One should accept the instruction of the spiritual master as one's life and soul."
(SB, 3.24.5, purport)

However, GBC voted-in guru **HH Śivarāma Swami ("SRS")** has admitted that this is no longer happening in ISKCON. We analyse his reasons for why he claims this is the case and then present the actual reality. All quotes in shaded boxes are taken from a lecture given by him on 14/5/22. All emphases added.

Śrīla Prabhupāda inspired surrender

"we did whatever Prabhupāda said, and it was based on very, very strong emphasis that Śrīla Prabhupāda gave to actually accepting the instruction of spiritual master as one's life and soul. [...] Devotees' ability for sacrifice, austerity, to just jump [...] I'm just trying to emphasize that that was what actually really made ISKCON, that was the ISKCON that we came to. [...] that's what it was, that's what Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement was. Prabhupāda just said give me your life, and then we did it."

SRS first explains that when the movement was exclusively following Śrīla Prabhupāda as everyone's *dikṣā* guru, Śrīla Prabhupāda was able to inspire them to fully surrender to him and accept his instructions as their life and soul. Which in turn led to the success of the ISKCON movement he founded since devotees were willing to sacrifice everything to follow Śrīla Prabhupāda's orders.

GBC gurus don't inspire surrender

SRS then goes on to admit that with himself and his GBC guru colleagues acting as *dikṣā* gurus rather than Śrīla Prabhupāda, such inspiration for surrender is not there:

"The devotees who are giving their lives and [sic] to the Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement is on the decline. Full time devotees. [...] Do gurus have the faith that they can tell the disciple, 'I want you to be a full-time devotee'? I can't say I have. I can't say that I can tell you, 'Okay, this is what I want you to do all your life.' Any devotee."

Thus, it is SRS and his GBC guru colleagues who have caused this lack of surrender, being unable to inspire their disciples to become full-time devotees, in the way Śrīla Prabhupāda could when he was acting as everyone's exclusive *dikṣā* guru.

"Rtvik philosophy"

However, SRS claims that the reason for a decline in surrender is not the fault of the GBC gurus, but the "rtvik philosophy" (as the IRM's position is called in ISKCON):

"ideologies that, you could call them, which are actually just attacking the very fibre of this guru-disciple relationship. So there's rtvik philosophy [...] when we start tinkering with this importance of the position of the spiritual master, then we will actually decrease the ability of devotees to do what it takes to spread Kṛṣṇa consciousness all over the world. Devotees' ability for sacrifice, austerity, to just jump, that will stop."

SRS claims that:

- 1) The "rtvik philosophy" attacks "the very fibre" of the "guru-disciple relationship";
- 2) Which leads to changing the "importance of the position of the spiritual master";
- 3) Which in turn will lead to a decrease in devotees' surrender and ability to "spread Kṛṣṇa consciousness".


False blame

But "rtvik philosophy", or the position advocated by the IRM, does the *exact opposite* of what SRS claims:

a) It states that we should have Śrīla Prabhupāda as our *dikṣā* guru – which SRS himself states led to devotees surrendering fully and thus pushing on the ISKCON movement.

b) It *emphasises* the "importance of the position of the spiritual master", by stating that "the position of the spiritual master" **must** be occupied by the *actual* spiritual master and not an unauthorised imposter.

One can easily verify that points a) and b) are what the "rtvik philosophy" states by consulting the "rtvik bible" (as so named by SRS's GBC guru colleagues, **HH Jayādvaita Swami** and **HH Bhakti Vikāsa Swami**) – *The Final Order*. Thus, the cause of the decline in surrender to the GBC gurus may indeed be due to not appreciating the "importance of the position of the spiritual master", because the position is now filled with unauthorised imposters in the form of GBC gurus rather than the bona fide spiritual master, Śrīla Prabhupāda – which in turn has led to this decline in surrender and spreading of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, as we just quoted SRS admitting. Thus, this decline has not been caused **by** the "rtvik philosophy", but by **not following** the "rtvik philosophy" and not accepting the real guru, Śrīla Prabhupāda.



Śrīla Prabhupāda inspires full surrender

False program

"we've had disappointing, a disappointment in ISKCON where gurus give up their role of spiritual master. But that's just part of our history. [...] Even our own founder of our *Brahmā-sampradāya*, we also see that there are historical records of his conduct being not according to standard [...] when Vaiṣṇavas don't act according to the expectation of their position. But nonetheless *sākṣād-hari*"

SRS states that even if the guru does not act as a guru, he should *still* be accepted as being a bona fide guru and worshipped as 'good as God' – "*sākṣād-hari*". As evidence for this proposition, he refers to the conduct of the "founder of our *Brahmā-sampradāya*" – Lord Brahmā – not being like that of a guru. This conduct refers to an incident where he was attracted to his daughter. However, SRS merely displays his gross ignorance of even basic Kṛṣṇa conscious philosophy by using this as an example, because Śrīla Prabhupāda explains that these activities occurred **before** Lord Brahmā became the head of our *sampradāya*:

"This extraordinary immorality on the part of Brahmā [...] before the hearing of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* he might have fallen a victim to such sensuality, but after hearing *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* directly from the Lord, there was no possibility of such failures."
(SB, 3.12.28, purport)

Thus, in reality, Śrīla Prabhupāda has never taught that one who is not a bona fide guru should be worshipped as such.

Conclusion

Śrīla Prabhupāda inspires the disciple to fully surrender, whereas the GBC gurus do not. And this is admitted by a GBC guru himself! And the cause is *not* due to preaching that we must accept Śrīla Prabhupāda as the *dikṣā* guru, but due to *not* accepting Śrīla Prabhupāda as the *dikṣā* guru.

GBC Guru Does Not Give *Dīkṣā*

Śrīla Prabhupāda teaches that the *dīkṣā* guru transmits transcendental knowledge:

"Dīkṣā actually means initiating a disciple with transcendental knowledge by which he becomes freed from all material contamination."

(Cc., *Madhya-līlā*, 4.111, purport)

And the GBC has admitted in GBC Resolution 404, 1999, that the "preeminent" transmitter of *divya-jñāna* (transcendental knowledge), which is the "principal ingredient of *dīkṣā*", is Śrīla Prabhupāda. Hence, it is an undisputed fact that in ISKCON it is Śrīla Prabhupāda who gives the *divya-jñāna* that the *dīkṣā* guru gives.

This then raises the question of what exactly the GBC gurus are giving, if not *dīkṣā*? All emphases added.

I am a *bhakta* leader

GBC voted-in guru, **HH Bhakti Vikāsa Swami ("BVKS")** gives some examples of why other gurus such as himself are needed, and why we can't just rely on Śrīla Prabhupāda as being our *dīkṣā* guru:

1) To show us how to use a bead bag and put on *tilak*:

*"someone may say, 'Well, I just came to Kṛṣṇa consciousness by reading Śrīla Prabhupāda's books', I can be a disciple directly of Prabhupāda. But no one trained, did no one tell you to put your hand in your bead bag and showed you how to do it and showed you how to put on *tilak* and all these things? They're also gurus, can't deny that. I shouldn't deny it."*

(BVKS Lecture, "Guru Issues, Part 13", 19/1/22)

2) To tell us to get up for *maṅgala-ārati*:

"if I just keep on saying, I tell, 'Rise early in the morning, maṅgala-ārati 4:30, don't have maṅgala-ārati at 7 o'clock or just whenever you feel like it, have a fixed morning program. If I just insist on this, even if I do only that, that will be a great help for so many.'"

(BVKS Lecture, "Guru Issues, Part 12", 3/1/22)

However, any experienced temple devotee can fulfil these types of functions. One does not need successor 'good as God' GBC *dīkṣā* gurus for such help to be given!

I don't have knowledge

BVKS also claims that GBC gurus are needed to "apply" knowledge to the current changing circumstances:

"the practical application of the philosophy [...] there are things arise with the advancement of science [...] that's one reason why the param-

parā goes on, because there are different challenges which arise and the devotees in disciplic succession have to take the knowledge from the previous generations and apply it in the changing times and circumstances that they find themselves in."

(BVKS Lecture, 8/11/21)

A perfect example of such challenges due to the "advancement of science" is knowing if one should use vaccines, yet BVKS admits he does not even have such knowledge!

"just like this vaccine question, [...] apart from so many other controversies going on in and around the ISKCON world, there's the vaccine controversy. Some say you must get vaccinated, Prabhupāda would have done it, and others saying don't get vaccinated, Prabhupāda would have told us not to get vaccinated, and I don't know."

(BVKS Lecture, 8/11/21)

BVKS mentions that there are "so many" controversies going on in ISKCON. This is because GBC gurus differ with each other regarding how to "apply" knowledge and thus one cannot even be sure which, or if any, GBC guru is actually giving the correct knowledge. A major example of this is whether we can have female *dīkṣā* gurus, due to which BVKS states:

"the whole movement is on the verge of a split"

(BVKS Lecture, 20/1/22)

I can't remove sin

BVKS correctly states that *dīkṣā* also involves the removal of sin:

"dīkṣā, the process by which spiritual knowledge is imparted, and sin is removed."

(BVKS Lecture, "Guru Issues, Part 6", 7/11/21)

However, BVKS has also stated that GBC gurus themselves do not need to be pure or free from contamination:

"It can be tough being lauded as a great spiritual personality when you have your own internal struggles with lust, pride, envy [...] one guru may envy another [...] there may be within the heart some contamination"

(BVKS Lecture, "Guru Issues, Part 7", pub. 1/12/21)


"why should I take such a role if I'm unfit? It's a valid question."

(BVKS Lecture, "Guru Issues, Part 12", 3/1/22)

Thus, such GBC gurus cannot destroy sin when they are not free from sin themselves. For Śrīla Prabhupāda taught:

"Because the bound cannot help the bound, the rescuer must be liberated."

(Bg., 7.14, purport)



I take the IRM's knowledge

In addition, the type of "knowledge" that BVKS does give in many cases involves explaining exactly the same things that the IRM explains, by focusing on how ISKCON is deviating, how the GBC gurus are deviating, how we must point out such defects boldly, and so on. For example:

1) In 2010, BTP 30 reported on a bogus practice taking place in some ISKCON centres where the Deities were being dressed on Christmas day in Santa Claus outfits. In a lecture on 20/1/22, BVKS spoke about how he "pointed out" deviations, and how, if they are pointed out, then "there can be rectification", and gives as an example "to dress Kṛṣṇa on Christmas Day in a Santa outfit!"

2) In another lecture on "Guru Issues" (Part 2) published 10/10/21, he spoke about deviant GBC gurus and how, by following them, "in the name of devotional service it will deflect people away or bring them into something which appears to be like devotional service but which is not". Which is merely repeating what we highlight in every BTP issue.

3) Indeed, in the same lecture, he is forced to admit that by devoting so much time and effort to explain such things, then, just like the IRM, "it could be said that I'm a fault finder to even take so seriously and discuss such things!"

There are many more such examples from his lectures.

Conclusion

Once we analyse the GBC gurus' "contribution" in detail:

1) We can easily see that the transcendental knowledge required for *dīkṣā* is actually given by Śrīla Prabhupāda.

2) Any valid "knowledge" or "help" that they actually "give" themselves, can also be given by any other experienced devotee or even the IRM!

The Failure of ISKCON

In previous issues, we have exposed the deviations and lack of philosophical understanding displayed by the GBC's "brain", the "Śāstric Advisory Council" ("SAC"). The SAC is the body of supposed "brahminical" advisors that was formed to help guide the GBC. ISKCON India has created its own rival "brahminical" advisory body, the "ISKCON India Scholars Board" ("IISB"). Which we will see in this article is just as unscholarly and philosophically deviant as its GBC counterpart. All quotes in shaded boxes are English translations of statements made in Hindi, in a video presentation titled "The Death of R̥tvikism", which was published by the IISB on 13/4/22. All emphases added.

Gross ignorance

"See, what Śrīla Prabhupāda said in the first page of the *Bhagavad-gītā*? It is said about the disciplic succession. Not said about the *ṛtvik* succession."

This IISB video presentation is dedicated solely to the topic of "ṛtvikism", by which they mean the position that Śrīla Prabhupāda remains ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru through the use of representatives, called "ṛtviks", to conduct initiations on his behalf. Hence, it is titled "The Death of R̥tvikism". However, IISB displays gross ignorance regarding the very subject this whole video presentation is supposed to address. Because there is no question of a "ṛtvik" succession, nor is anyone proposing such a thing. *R̥tviks* do not *succeed* Śrīla Prabhupāda, but rather *assist* Śrīla Prabhupāda in continuing to accept disciples as the current link in the disciplic succession. And, in the beginning of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, which the above statement from the IISB refers to, Śrīla Prabhupāda's name is actually listed as being the current link in the disciplic succession! Hence, there is no conflict between the disciplic succession and a person being the current link in that disciplic succession. For every disciplic succession must have a current link, and for ISKCON this is Śrīla Prabhupāda.

GBC guru cult

"in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, this instruction of the *ṛtvik* cult is not found."

1) As we have just seen, there is no such thing as a *ṛtvik* succession or *ṛtvik* cult and therefore this is an irrelevant argument. There is simply the "guru cult", and the instruction for this is given in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*:

"in order to receive the real message of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* one should approach the current link, or spiritual master in the chain of disciplic succession. After being initiated by the proper spiritual master in that chain of succession, one should engage himself in the discharge of *tapasya* in the execution of devotional service."

(SB, 2.9.7, purport)

And in ISKCON it is Śrīla Prabhupāda who is this current link in the disciplic succession, from whom we are receiving "the real message of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*".

2) We can further note that there is no instruction in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* for this current link to automatically be terminated the second he physically disappears. On the contrary, the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* teaches that to "receive the real message of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*", which the current link delivers, does not depend at all on the current link's physical presence:

"Reception of spiritual knowledge is never checked by any material condition."

(SB, 7.7.1, purport)

"The potency of transcendental sound is never minimized because the vibrator is apparently absent."

(SB, 2.9.8, purport)


Thus, Śrīla Prabhupāda remains ISKCON's current link to the disciplic succession.

3) However, it is a fact that the instruction for a GBC-created guru cult—which ISKCON India has fully supported and through which the IISB member presenting this video (a disciple of HH Bhakti Charu Swami) was himself initiated—is not found anywhere in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. There is no mention in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* of a managerial body creating 'good as God' *dikṣā* gurus via voting or any other method.

Yet more ignorance

"in the last Will of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, he did not make anyone a guru. He only made GBC. But, Śrīla Prabhupāda, after disappearance of that Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, he accepted disciples by becoming a spiritual master. So, this conduct of Śrīla Prabhupāda proves that even Śrīla Prabhupāda does not accept the *ṛtvik*-sect."

IISB here makes the claim that Śrīla Prabhupāda becoming a *dikṣā* guru somehow proves that Śrīla Prabhupāda does not accept the *ṛtvik* system of initiation, because his spiritual mas-



Śrīla Prabhupāda: IISB fails to remove him as current link

ter, Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, left a GBC and did not make anyone a successor *dikṣā* guru. However, in making this assertion, the IISB merely reveals its gross ignorance of Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings. Śrīla Prabhupāda explains what instructions Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura actually gave for his succession:

"His idea was *acarya* was not to be nominated amongst the governing body. He said openly you make a GBC and conduct the mission. So his idea was amongst the members of GBC who would come out successful and self effulgent *acarya* would be automatically selected"

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter, 28/4/74)

"His idea was "Let them manage; then whoever will be actual qualified for becoming *ācārya*, they will elect. Why I should enforce upon them?" That was his plan. "Let them manage by strong governing body, as it is going on. Then *ācārya* will come by his qualifications."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda, Room Conversation, 21/9/73)

Thus, Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura specifically authorised that a self-effulgent successor *ācārya* should be selected by a GBC. "That was his plan". But Śrīla Prabhupāda did not give any such plan or order for a self-effulgent successor *ācārya* to be selected by the GBC. On the contrary, on July 9th, 1977, he ordered that the GBC would manage a *ṛtvik* system of initiation for the whole of ISKCON, which would keep Śrīla Prabhupāda as the *Ācārya* and *dikṣā* guru of ISKCON. Hence, whilst Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura did authorise a successor *ācārya*, Śrīla Prabhupāda did not. Therefore, Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura's orders do not prove what Śrīla Prabhupāda's orders were, as they were actually different.

India's "Scholars"

Illiteracy

Śrīla Prabhupāda stated in his Will that the GBC was to be "the ultimate managing authority" of ISKCON:

"DECLARATION OF WILL [...]"

1. The Governing Body Commission (GBC) will be the ultimate managing authority of the entire International Society for Krishna Consciousness."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda, Declaration of Will, 4/6/77)

However, IISB claims that this statement in Śrīla Prabhupāda's Will does *not* mean that the GBC was to be ISKCON's ultimate managing authority for after his physical departure:

"So that last Will of Prabhupāda [...] here Prabhupāda nowhere said that GBC will continue to be the managing director even after my disappearance. So, you are interpreting that GBC will continue to be the managing director even after Prabhupāda's disappearance. This is your interpretation. And this interpretation is wrong"

1) By **definition**, anything written in a Will means "after my disappearance". That is the function of a Will, to list actions to be instituted only and specifically "after my disappearance". Hence, it is not an "interpretation" that the GBC "will continue to be the managing director even after Prabhupāda's disappearance". It is a **fact**. A fact which can be comprehended by anyone who possesses the basic literacy to know what a "Will" is. We suggest that IISB's "scholars" return to the dictionary and look up the definition of "Will".

2) Even the IISB video presenter's own guru, **HH Bhakti Charu Swami**, accepted this basic fact by referring to the GBC as being the "ultimate managing authority" of ISKCON, being the line of authority "we have" today after Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical disappearance:

"Prabhupāda pointed out that the GBC is the ultimate managing authority in ISKCON. In the line of authority, next to Śrīla Prabhupāda is the GBC body, and then there is the GBC member; every zone has a GBC member who is the zonal secretary. So we should be loyal to the GBC body and to the GBC member. [...] In this way we have the line of authority."

(HH Bhakti Charu Swami, Disciples Meeting, 1/8/07)

Same uniformity remains

"So, you are interpreting that GBC will continue to be the managing director even after Prabhupāda's disappearance [...] this interpretation is wrong, because our scriptures refer to

how the meaning of any dictum should be taken. Our Ācāryas have said about this [...] What is said in the foreword, the same uniformity will remain in the epilogue. Only the same will be said."

IISB claims here that the same instruction must be given at the start (foreword) and the end (epilogue). And this therefore somehow invalidates the GBC continuing to be the managing authority of ISKCON after Śrīla Prabhupāda's disappearance. However, even if we accept this argument of the IISB to be correct, we can note that in 1970, Śrīla Prabhupāda mentioned the concept of the GBC for ISKCON for the first time. Thus, this becomes the "foreword" regarding the GBC, and in this he stated:

"As we have increased our volume of activities, now I think a Governing Body Commission (hereinafter referred to as the GBC) should be established. I am getting old, 75 years old, therefore at any time I may be out of the scene, therefore I think it is necessary to give instruction to my disciples how they shall manage the whole institution. [...] While I am living they will act as my zonal secretaries and after my demise they will be known as Executors. [...] The purpose of the Governing Body Commission is to act as the instrument for the execution of the Will of His Divine Grace."

(Direction of Management, 28/7/70)

Thus, in this "foreword", Śrīla Prabhupāda clearly states that his idea is that the GBC is meant for managing ISKCON both in his physical presence and his physical absence. Then, in 1977, Śrīla Prabhupāda states in his Will ("epilogue") the *same* instruction, that the GBC will be the ultimate managing authority after Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical disappearance (as that is when the Will takes effect) as we just quoted in the previous section. Therefore, there is the same uniformity regarding what is said in the "foreword" and "epilogue" about the GBC always being the managing authority of ISKCON.

Rejecting their own evidence

"At present, many such people come and tell in online media that Śrīla Prabhupāda has not made anyone an initiating spiritual master. [...] So this is a misconception of those people. Prabhupāda has said in many places in his scriptures, in many lectures, and in the letters of Prabhupāda, that after me, my disciples will become spiritual masters."

IISB presents 2 quotes to try to support this

"We suggest that ISKCON India's Scholars Board acquires a dictionary and basic literacy"

claim that Śrīla Prabhupāda has ordered his disciples to be "an initiating spiritual master":

1) The first quote is from a letter dated 2/12/75 which speaks about the "law of disciplic succession" and this quote refers to it being applicable to "every student" and "my disciples".

2) The second quote is from a letter dated 25/1/69 which also speaks about the disciplic succession and this quote refers to it being applicable to "my disciples" and "these many disciples" (which at the time included females).

a) Thus, both of these letters make it clear that Śrīla Prabhupāda is referring to all of his disciples, both male and female, as proven by the use of the words "every", "my" and "many". These quotes would therefore be applicable to Śrīla Prabhupāda's *female* disciples.

b) However, we already know that ISKCON India has vehemently rejected the proposition that Śrīla Prabhupāda authorised female *dikṣā* gurus. As documented in the last *BTP* issue, the **India Continental Committee ("ICC")**, which is the body that represents ISKCON India's leaders, has passed a resolution stating that:

"the current introduction of Female Diksha Gurus (FDG) is [...] deviant and a misrepresentation of Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings [...] Therefore, it is resolved that: Until the GBC resolution on FDG is withdrawn by the GBC body, the ICC will not accept the GBC as authority and will protest with non co-operation."

c) Therefore, according to ISKCON India, these two letters are not evidence that Śrīla Prabhupāda is referring to ordering initiating or *dikṣā* gurus, because they have already declared that Śrīla Prabhupāda never ordered female *dikṣā* gurus, period. Hence, they are putting forward as "evidence" something that they have already stated is not evidence!

Conclusion

As noted, the IISB presentation was titled "The Death of R̥tvikism", but as we have seen, all the presentation has achieved is the death of the credibility of the IISB and ISKCON India as being any sort of "scholarly" organisation.

BTP Interactive

Only chanting required

"Maybe you are aware of the *praṇāyāma* breathing course which is being run by ISKCON UK headquarters' School of Bhakti (and for which they charge a fee). Called "The Art of Breathing", it is advertised as follows:

"The fourth stage in the ancient path of Ash-tanga Yoga is the practice of Pranayama, or control of the breath. [...] Pranayama serves as an important bridge between the external, active practices of yoga, like asana, and the internal subtle practices that lead us into higher states of consciousness. Broadly, the course looks at several useful Pranayamas, how imbalanced prana can become a cause of "dis-ease" in the body and highlights the benefits of controlled breathing on your health and your practice of Bhakti."

Is such a course in line with Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings?"

- Dilip Patel, London, UK

Editor replies:

This is what Śrīla Prabhupāda states regarding practising such kind of breathing exercises:

Devotee (1): "Swamiji, I think she means do you have to do any kind of breathing exercising besides chanting?"

Prabhupāda: "No. There is no breathing exercise or gymnastic. No. Nothing. The breathing exercise is there. When you chant Hare Kṛṣṇa there is breathing. There is nice breathing. Yes?"

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 26/3/68, all emphases in Interactive added)

"You don't have to practice the meditation, samādhi, dhyāna, dhāraṇā, āsana, praṇāyāma, this aṣṭāṅga-yoga. Without practicing aṣṭāṅga-yoga, you simply practice the one simple thing, simply thinking of the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa always; then you become a first-class yogī. It is not our statement; it is Kṛṣṇa's statement. [...] So our this Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement is so nice that if we take it seriously, then immediately, on the first stage, we become a first-class yogī. Immediately, without any bodily endeavor, mystic exercise. No need. In the Kali-yuga it is not possible."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 13/11/72)

"Here you will find the students, although they are not exercising the bodily āsana, praṇāyāma, it is automatically being done, because the mind is the center of all activity. So mind is always engaged in

Kṛṣṇa. That is *bhāgavata-dharma*."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Lecture, 12/6/68)

Therefore, we can see that Śrīla Prabhupāda discouraged this type of "breathing" practice and did not advise that it had "benefits" for our "practice of Bhakti".

Protection and worshipping Tulasi

"Hare Kṛṣṇa, Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All Glories to Śrīla Prabhupāda.


Thank you for Issue 72 of BTP.

I thought to respond to your article about "Vaiṣṇavī Dikṣā Gurus Cultural Sensitivity Resolution" because I was personally involved in dealing with Vaiṣṇavīs including *brahmacāriṇis* and my own teenage daughter around the 1980s to do with their domestic abuse, physically and sexually. I was given this service to deal with these issues because I am a fully qualified naturopath and at the time practising. Would it be possible for you and other senior ISKCON leaders to propose to the GBC because through history these sensitive issues were never properly addressed and most likely happened and could possibly be happening at the present, principally because of the deviating from *The Final Order*. So, my proposal is that the GBC should accept to initiate Vaiṣṇavīs via the *ṛtvik* system which would automatically be a safeguard to those GBC voted-in gurus and safeguard the *mātājīs* from having to deal with them at all as they would then only deal with Śrīla Prabhupāda. Then not needing female *dikṣā* gurus at all. As we know, as far as Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa is concerned, there is no difference between gender and other living entities, that everyone benefits from Kṛṣṇa's mercy in the form of the *mahā-mantra*, therefore, it is as important to avoid discriminating against *mātājīs*, Vaiṣṇavīs, as they deserve as much respect as *Prabhus*, and probably even more respect as they are so vulnerable to abuse as I have personally experienced in ISKCON.

I also have a question you may be able to help me with. At my local temple, the *mātājī* who cares for Śrīmatī Tulasi Devī recently told me that only Rāma Tulasi can be used for Deity worship. I had not heard of this before and could not find any information regarding this regulation. Could you tell me if this is the actual fact?

Your humble servant,"

- Ananta-śeṣa Dāsa, New South Wales, Australia



Śrīla Prabhupāda:
Promotes the art of chanting

Editor replies:

1) Your suggestion to protect ladies by ensuring that they only have Śrīla Prabhupāda as their *dikṣā* guru is not only good, but also what Śrīla Prabhupāda ordered (as documented in *The Final Order*). However, he also ordered that everyone, including men, should have the same protection by being Śrīla Prabhupāda's disciples. Unfortunately, the GBC, the majority of whom are themselves GBC voted-in gurus, have not shown any interest in following this order from Śrīla Prabhupāda, but rather have only been committed to perpetuating the system whereby GBC gurus replace Śrīla Prabhupāda as ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru.

2) Just as you have stated, we have also not found any recorded instruction wherein Śrīla Prabhupāda states that only Rāma Tulasi can be used for Deity worship. Rather, Śrīla Prabhupāda used "Tulasi" for Kṛṣṇa/Rāma Tulasi interchangeably, and also stated that both are the same:

"Goursundar Prabhu informs me that you are head Tulasi gardner at New Nabadwipa. Now 'Krishna Tulasi' is there also. You surely must be a great devotee. Tulasi devi is growing so profusely there and that is surely to your credit. So continue with this valuable service and become fixed up in Krishna consciousness. [...] And by the grace of Srimati Tulasi Devi surely you will make rapid advancement in Krishna Consciousness."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter, 23/7/71)

"For Krishna Tulasi and Rama Tulasi the worship is the same. There is no difference between Rama and Krishna. Both are the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Simply they are expansions of the same Absolute Truth."

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter, 20/11/71)

Therefore, given that Śrīla Prabhupāda has only told us that "Tulasi" should be used –

BTP Interactive (continued)

“All Visnu-tattva Deities require profusely Tulasī leaves.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter, 7/4/70)

– and the facts above, that Śrīla Prabhupāda refers to the two Tulasīs interchangeably and states that they are non-different:

There is no evidence from Śrīla Prabhupāda to conclude that Deity worship must be restricted to only using Rāma Tulasī.

Only authorised, liberated gurus

“Thank you so much for the books and magazines recently received. They have reaffirmed everything I believed about the position of initiating gurus in ISKCON which caused me so much anger and confusion over the years before I left. The treatment received from these men and the GBC body and in particular the zonal gurus often led to a situation where devotees claiming to be disciples of these devotees assumed authority over devotees Śrīla Prabhupāda personally initiated and trained. If one didn’t kowtow to these imposters, one was often demeaned and shunned. Now the situation sees ridiculous appellations to a disciple’s name such as JPS or ACBSW... what a lot of schism forming garbage!

However, I was recently reading an account by Bhūrijana about Śrīla Prabhupāda dealing with Siddhasvarūpa and I have a memory that Śrīla Prabhupāda said something along the lines that he could be a guru and take disciples but not in the presence of his spiritual master. Can I ask your argument against this letter being an invitation to all of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s disciples to initiate? And of course this one:

In a letter to Janārdana on April 26, 1968, Prabhupāda wrote, “A person who is liberated *ācārya* and guru cannot commit any mistake, but there are persons who are less qualified or not liberated, but still can act as guru and *ācārya* by strictly following the disciplic succession.”

– G. Stanley, Bali, Indonesia

Editor replies:

The first letter you are referring to is the one sent to Siddhasvarūpa’s follower Tuṣṭa Kṛṣṇa, wherein Śrīla Prabhupāda says:

“during the lifetime of your Spiritual master you bring the prospective disciples to him, and in his absence or disappearance you can accept disciples without any limitation. This is the law of disciplic succession.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter to Tuṣṭa Kṛṣṇa, 2/12/75)

1) This letter simply states that a disciple initiating **can** only happen after Śrīla Prabhupāda has physically departed. Śrīla Prabhupāda is stating the time period in which such a thing may occur.

But, in order for this **to** happen, at least 2 conditions need to be satisfied:

a) Śrīla Prabhupāda renounces his position as ISKCON’s *dikṣā* guru.

b) There exist some qualified disciples, and Śrīla Prabhupāda authorises these qualified disciples to take his position as ISKCON’s *dikṣā* guru.

None of these things happened, and indeed the absence of a) alone precludes b) from happening.

2) Regarding the letter to Janārdana you sent, here is what it states, with numbering added to the sentences for ease of reference:

“On the whole, you may know that he is not a liberated person, and therefore, he cannot initiate any person to Krishna Consciousness. [1] [...] Generally the spiritual master comes from the group of such eternal associates of the Lord; but anyone who follows the principles of such ever liberated persons is as good as one in the above mentioned group. [2] [...] A person who is liberated acharya and guru cannot commit any mistake, but there are persons who are less qualified or not liberated, but still can act as guru and acharya by strictly following the disciplic succession. [3]”


a) Sentence 1 makes it clear that a non-liberated person cannot be a *dikṣā* guru.

b) Sentence 2 states that the *dikṣā* guru is generally a *nitya-siddha*, i.e. ever liberated, but others who are not *nitya-siddha* (*sādhana-siddha*) can also become qualified to be a spiritual master by following the principles of such ever liberated gurus.

c) Sentence 3 simply repeats what sentence 2 just said by stating that those who are not liberated, i.e. the *sādhana-siddhas*, can also become *dikṣā* gurus by strictly following the disciplic succession. Obviously, as a result of such strict following, they will become qualified to act as a *dikṣā* guru, i.e. liberated. This is confirmed by sentence 1 which states that only such a person can act as a *dikṣā* guru.

Nonsense Corner

This is a column in which we answer articles or statements that have been forwarded to us by our readers for rebutting.



During a recent lecture given at ISKCON UK headquarters Bhaktivedanta Manor (on 21/5/22), a member of the audience asked the lecturer what “statement or quote” the “*rtviks*” have to justify their position. (Those who advocate the IRM’s position – that we must accept Śrīla Prabhupāda as ISKCON’s *dikṣā* guru by following the *rtvik* system of initiation which Śrīla Prabhupāda ordered by issuing the July 9th, 1977, directive – are called “*rtviks*” by those in ISKCON).

The quotes in shaded boxes are taken from the lecturer’s answer to this question, with our comments interspersed beneath.

“when Śrīla Prabhupāda was physically here, sometimes he could not physically be present to perform the actual *yajña* for the initiation ceremony [...] but somebody else would perform the actual *yajña* [...] the person who does the *yajña* on behalf of the spiritual master, is known as the *rtvik*, like they’re almost like an extension, right. So, the *rtvik* philosophy is Śrīla Prabhupāda didn’t give anybody else authority to be a *dikṣā* guru, he just wanted us to be *rtviks*, so we’re actually, we’re just initiating on behalf of Śrīla Prabhupāda, everybody’s a Śrīla Prabhupāda disciple and that’s it.”

1) The lecturer completely ignores the actual question that is asked. She explains what the *rtvik* system is. However, this was *not* the question asked, since presumably the questioner already knew what the *rtvik* system is, otherwise they would not be asking about what the *evidence* for such a system is.

2) Thus, the actual question asked – what “quote” or “statement” *rtviks* have to justify their position – is not answered by the lecturer. If the lecturer was honest, she could have either:

a) Stated she does not know;

b) Or offered the evidence we put forward. The lecturer could then even have tried to rebut such evidence if she wanted.

BTP Interactive (continued)

It is telling, therefore, that the lecturer makes no attempt to actually answer the question she was asked, but instead gives an irrelevant answer for a question that was not asked. Such evasion is indicative of how ISKCON attempts to “answer” the IRM’s position – i.e. they **cannot** answer it, and hence they do not even bother to try!

“the main thing is they just go around criticising everybody, usually for human happenings and human faults, or they just make it up. That’s what criticisers do, they just make stuff up most of the time. Or they’ll take something really quite simple and magnify it.”

Having failed to answer the question asked, the lecturer then instead offers what she claims is actually the “main thing”. And proceeds to do the very thing she falsely accuses us of doing: “criticising” and “making things up” and unnecessarily fault finding. It is unclear whether she has even read *The Final Order* (dubbed by ISKCON’s leaders as the *rtvik* “bible”) or other IRM literature, for if she had, she would see that “the main thing” we do is simply repeat Śrīla Prabhupāda’s instructions and compare them to ISKCON leaders’ statements and actions – or simply compare ISKCON leaders’ own statements with each other! – and to date nobody has been able to point out a single untrue statement we have made. We invite the lecturer to attempt to actually understand our position rather than simply fabricating things.

“But you know they’re also criticising Śrīla Prabhupāda in one sense because to say that yeah, Prabhupāda is the *Jagat Guru*, he’s a pure devotee, but to say he can’t, he’s not qualified to make other teachers, that’s like the biggest insult. Oh, you’re a really amazing teacher but you’re not good enough to make other teachers. You’re not good enough to make other pure devotees. That’s not, you know, it just doesn’t make any sense.”

The lecturer continues to completely “make things up” by fabricating a straw man argument since she cannot address what we *actually* state. We have never stated that Śrīla Prabhupāda was incapable of creating other teachers or pure devotees. Rather, *The Final Order* states the complete opposite:

“all we are stating is that Śrīla Prabhupāda did set up the *ritvik* system to allow initiations to continue. Whether or not Śrīla Prabhupāda created pure devotees is not relevant to his clear and unequivocal final

order. [...] Śrīla Prabhupāda may have created many pure devotees [...] It is nowhere stated that it is *mandatory* for a pure devotee to become a *dikṣā* guru. Such persons would be delighted to work within the *ritvik* system if that was their guru’s order.”

“So, yeah, rather than getting upset, fighting, I think it’s helpful when we have more of the proper explanations. [...] So that’s the *rtvik*.”

We agree that rather than “getting upset, fighting”, it is “helpful when we have more of the proper explanations”. Thus, we agree that it would have been helpful for the lecturer to have actually given “more of the proper explanations” regarding the evidence the “*rtvik*” position is actually based on – rather than cheating and misleading her audience – beginning with having the honesty to explain what we *actually* state.

Appreciation

“Dear Krishnakant Prabhu,


Please accept my humble obeisance. All glories to Śrīla Prabhupāda.

In many purports, Prabhupāda uses the word “significant” to draw importance to the meaning of certain Sanskrit words or words for the spiritual practitioner. This word “significant” also comes to my mind in BTP 69, as the first article offers the bogus solution to the GBC guru hoax from GBC “advisor” Urmilā Dāsī. [Please see “GBC’s Chief Advisor Explains Guru Hoax”, at this link: iskconirm.com/udd]

As in the *varṇāśrama* system, if the *brāhmaṇa* or the head is blind, then the rest of society will be led into the ditch. Similarly, if the “head” of the GBC is blind about the simple truth about Prabhupāda remaining as ISKCON’s *Ācārya*, then the rest of ISKCON also remains blind. And so, in BTP 69, after the Urmilā article, you therefore see the darkness of all the leaders following the blind path – Badrī, Sureśvara, Bhaktimārga, Mālātī, etc.

As for the BTP 69 article “Don’t Forget Me” [which can be read here: iskconirm.com/sur], Sureśvara would do better preaching to his old friend from Gītā-nagarī in the 80s, Satsvarūpa Dāsa, to wear white instead of charadring around the world fooling innocent, stolen disciples of Prabhupāda about Tamāla’s [HH Tamāla Kṛṣṇa Gosvāmī] guru lineage*.

As well, Sureśvara would do better to revive the cow protection in Gītā-nagarī where all the cows from the 80s were sent to the slaughterhouse. For those who doubt the effi-



cacy of BTP, it has really helped me in my spiritual life as showing me the pathway to Prabhupāda, not to the other *rasta* (road) to ISKCON guru hoaxers.

Covid has disconnected me from the Toronto temple for close to two years now. With this experience, it is now possible to not continue much with the association of supporters of and the guru hoaxers.

It has been more than ten years since I wanted to tell you that you have a knack to reverse the “weaponry” of Tamāla’s lineage to defeat their arguments. Many examples are there in BTPs.

The guru hoaxers would take pleasure if you die somehow. But they would think a million before trying to kill you. After all, Kīrtanānanda Dāsa showed the perfect example for an “*ācārya*” of the consequences of murdering. It would be foolhardy for any ISKCON fake guru or GBC to dare doing so as they would be sailing from uncharted waters into dangerous “Bermuda waters”. At most, for example, we see the shouts and threats of that Indian lady and Ravindra-svarūpa at the Detroit Ratha-yātrā. [Please see here for that footage: iskconirm.com/rsd] All glories to your service. You are a great saviour.

* It is widely accepted that Tamāla Kṛṣṇa Gosvāmī (TKG) was the main architect for the formation of the zonal *ācāryas* in Vrindavan soon after Prabhupāda passed away under his supervision amid his tight “security”. He was a “powerful” personality and was even deemed to need anger management. After the zonal *ācāryas* were seen to be crumbling, the subsequent new voted-in “gurus” are seen as having roots with TKG. A close friend of mine who served Prabhupāda along with TKG coined this term to me, “Tamāla’s lineage”, so I have decided to use it here.

Y.S.”

- Devala Dāsa, Toronto, Canada

BTP Interactive (continued)

"Dear Krishnakant Prabhu,
Hare Kṛṣṇa,

I got the latest BTP issue. Thank you. It is always inspiring to read it. I especially appreciated the section "Are temples essential for bhakti?" from BTP 71 [which can be read here: iskconirm.com/71].

I am continuing to translate *The Final Order* into Slovak. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

Your servant,"

- **Vaclav Dvorak, South Moravia, Czech Republic**

"I appreciate your works and efforts very much, keep it up! Don't ever stop. Thank you, very much appreciated. Looking forward to reading it ASAP.

I very greatly appreciate the works this organization (of yours) is doing. I cannot even begin to explain how much I have felt for a time and continue to feel the exact same way! Basically, the entire general "umbrella" concept of *Back To Prabhupāda*. I appreciate all of you, and am on board entirely 1,000,000%! More than words.

Jai Śrī Kṛṣṇa! Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa!!

Hare Kṛṣṇa,"

- **Ronald Tompkins, New York, USA**

"Haribol, Krishnakant, and all glories to His Divine Grace, Śrīla Prabhupāda.

We have been receiving BTP for so many years now and it has always been a valuable light and guidance to us. Thank you so much for all your efforts. Once more, many thanks for all your support and may THE LORD'S blessings be with you."

- **Michael Wurm & spouse Kristine Nusbauma, San Jose, Costa Rica**

"Hare Kṛṣṇa,

I am a new student of ISKCON.

I was astonished reading the information on your website [www.iskconirm.com] regarding some gurus of ISKCON not following the Last Will of Śrīla Prabhupāda Swami.

However, I am delighted that I discovered your Revival Movement. Hoping, I can join here as I continue to walk into my spiritual path.

Thank you very much. I am looking forward to be in association with the ISKCON Revival Movement, although there is no center near my place but it would be possible through online.

Thank you very much for the subscriptions. I am eager to have it soon.

Hare Kṛṣṇa!"

- **Raul Cardona, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines**

Editor replies:

When you receive our literature you will see that actually none of the so-called "gurus" in ISKCON, rather than just "some", are following Śrīla Prabhupāda.

"I hate the guru system in ISKCON, it's an absolute 100% failure. Fail, fail, fail, fail, fail, left and right. The absolute truth which can save countless millions of people has been tossed in the garbage can just to satisfy the ego of a few sociopaths."

- **Charles Cakra Hodgson, Gainesville, Florida**

[This refers to the IRM Ratha-yātrā distribution video – see here – iskconirm.com/rsd.]

"Anyone that would rip up pictures of Śrīla Prabhupāda (no matter what magazine or book they are in) is certainly the offensive one. Could anybody picture Śrīla Prabhupāda doing such a thing? If they disagree with the instructions we are trying to let everyone know about that Śrīla Prabhupāda gave... then they can use their intelligence to debate philosophically which they never have. They think they have... But they have not. Only they use strawman argument. You can see here they are uncontrolled with their emotions and behavior. They are definitely the offensive ones. If they saw meat eaters distributing that Jesus is the only way pamphlets... Do you think they would attack them? Of course not. They are simply envious of their own Godbrothers. This is demoniac behavior."


- **Devaki Devi Dāsī, Alachua, USA**

"We are four uninitiated "devotees" who for about two years have become aware of how ISKCON GBC has systematically changed the original translations of the books of A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda.

Thank you for your unconditional love for his Divine Grace Founder Ācārya International Society For Kṛṣṇa Consciousness and the brave "battles" you have been carrying on for over 20 years!! We have known you a few months ago through your website www.iskconirm.com and the beautiful magazine *Back To Prabhupāda*.

We are humble and ignorant... we would like to know how we can collaborate with you... we live in Naples in Italy, and it is only since 2017 that we have had the "grace" to know Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Vaiṣṇavas and our beloved Śrīla Prabhupāda.

We are relatively young (having an average of 40 years), we did not want to associate



with ISKCON Italia for various reasons, even before meeting you! Alone (do it yourself) we are studying *Bhagavad-gītā* (1976) and *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1982) in Italian: it is the "best we could find".

Hare Kṛṣṇa to all of you devotees."

- **Pietro Fontana, Naples, Italy**

"Long time friend, a believer of original idea of Kṛṣṇa movement when Śrīla Prabhupāda was guru. Thank you!"

- **Dan Hester, Alabama, USA**

"Dear Brothers and Sisters in Śrī Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa,

Thank you for your Love in Śrī Kṛṣṇa and devotion to Right. May you all find your True Self in the knowledge and understanding of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is ALL.

Hare Kṛṣṇa,"

- **Rādhā Kānta Dāsa, Oregon, USA**

"Makes truth known."

- **Nick Piacquadio, Florida, USA**

"Thank you so much for offering this! Hare Kṛṣṇa!"

- **Ryan Hailey, Tennessee, USA**

"Thanks for your glorious service to Śrīla Prabhupāda."

- **Hridayānanda Dāsa, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa**

"I thank you for your service to Śrīla Prabhupāda."

- **Gerardo Criscuoli, Brindisi, Italy**

"Please accept my respectful obeisances. You are doing a great service. Please send me all the issues and if you can send me original Prabhupāda BOOKS I will be indebted to you. JAY Prabhupāda."

- **Amiyo Ghosh, Chinsurah, India**

"I like your work, what can I do to help?"

- **Robert Phillips, California, USA**

Editor replies:

Please help us to spread the word that everyone must return "Back To Prabhupāda!"

Guru Defeats Himself Using “Śāstra”

We expose how the desire to have the power to decide when Śrīla Prabhupāda is speaking truthfully and when he is supposedly not has led to being trapped by one's own arguments. This has resulted in a GBC guru needing to accept that he can be rejected as an authorised guru! All emphases added.

Only “śāstra” counts

We have previously documented GBC guru **HH Hridayānanda Dāsa Goswami (“HD”)** boasting that he is such a strict follower of “śāstra” (scripture) that he will not even accept Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions as being absolute unless these instructions are in line with his understanding of śāstra. Thus, he states:

“Prabhupāda is speaking absolutely and infallibly when, in fact, he is quoting scriptures.”

(HD Ustream Lecture, iskconirm.com/ustream)

“Guru is not infallible when not repeating Shastra.”

(HD, “Q&A Śrīla Acharyadeva”, 5/6/13)

Hence, HD claims that Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions can be accepted as being the absolute truth when they are directly from śāstra. Thus, for example, he has stated that he doubts that the pastime involving the disrobing of Draupadī is true, even though Śrīla Prabhupāda states in his *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* purports that it is. Because HD claims that he has not located this pastime in “śāstra”. And, as quoted above, he claims that Śrīla Prabhupāda only needs to be accepted as speaking the truth if he is directly quoting śāstra (see BTP 40, “The Truth About Guru, Sadhu and Śāstra”). Thus, HD can reject any statement from Śrīla Prabhupāda's purports and books unless HD considers that these statements are directly repeating śāstra, since he “understands” śāstra:

“I don't just understand śāstra through Prabhupāda in the sense that okay, here he says this, [...] I know what the śāstra's conclusions are and I know how to read śāstra [...] So yes, I do understand śāstra.”

(HD “Darshan”, 15/9/19)

Management committee guru

As we showed in the BTP 70 article “Rtviks Reveal How They Became Gurus”, HD revealed that his authorisation to become a *dikṣā* guru successor to Śrīla Prabhupāda arose as follows:

“I didn't declare myself to be a guru, the GBC using their ultimate managing authority, authorized me to do that. [...] So, whatever you think Prabhupāda said, the GBC had the authority giv-

en by Prabhupāda to continue normal Vedic culture.”

(HD Interview, 12/6/21)

HD therefore makes it clear that:

1) His authority to become a *dikṣā* guru came from the GBC.

2) Indeed, he emphasises that what “Prabhupāda said” in regards to who became guru is not relevant, since the GBC already supposedly had the power from Śrīla Prabhupāda to “continue normal Vedic culture”, and this allows them to make *dikṣā* gurus.

Not śāstric guru

1) However, the GBC's Śāstric Advisory Council stated regarding the system of the GBC authorising *dikṣā* gurus that –

“Our present system has institutionalized a process of senior devotees voting or offering no-objection to prospective gurus. But we do not find that this institutionalized blessing-seeking process is mentioned by guru, sadhu or śāstra as the way that one is authorized to become a guru.”


(“Balancing the roles of the GBC and the disciple in Guru selection”, Śāstric Advisory Council)

– i.e. the idea that a management body can authorise one to become a *dikṣā* guru is not authorised by śāstra. Thus, the GBC, the very body from whom HD has admitted he derived his authority to become a *dikṣā* guru, is itself stating, via its advisory body, whom it has not rejected regarding this point, that their creating *dikṣā* gurus is not śāstric. Nor has HD, nor anyone else, produced the injunction in śāstra which states that:

“A management body can authorise dikṣā gurus.”

Therefore, neither the GBC, nor HD, have “quoted” or “repeated” any scriptures to justify the GBC making gurus, as HD demands of Śrīla Prabhupāda. Hence, becoming a *dikṣā* guru via the authority of a management committee, as HD did, is not authorised by śāstra according to the GBC and HD.

2) Thus, according to the GBC's own advisors, a management committee making *dikṣā* gurus cannot be “normal Vedic culture”, as such a thing is not even mentioned by guru, sadhu or śāstra, never mind mentioned as either being normal or Vedic. Therefore, the GBC acting to “continue normal Vedic culture” by making *dikṣā* gurus would itself be an act that is not “normal Vedic culture”, and thus be self-contradictory, according to the GBC.



HD (L): Desire to surpass Śrīla Prabhupāda leads to defeat by his own arguments

More importantly, in reality, Śrīla Prabhupāda never authorised the GBC to make successor *dikṣā* gurus anyway. He made the GBC the “ultimate managing authority”, which means the GBC only had the authority to execute Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions:

“The GBC has no other function or purpose other than to execute the instructions so kindly given by His Divine Grace”

(GBC Resolution 1, 1975)

And Śrīla Prabhupāda did not give any instructions:

- a) For successor *dikṣā* gurus;
- b) Or for the GBC to create *dikṣā* gurus.

I can be rejected as a guru

The authority from which HD derives his guru position, the GBC, has accepted that this guru position is supposedly not śāstric. Thus, HD must accept the GBC's conclusion that his guru position is not authorised by śāstra. HD claims his “śāstra” philosophy gives him the right to reject Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions if they are not directly repeated from śāstra, as he claims Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions are absolute only when quoting śāstra. Therefore, by this same teaching of his, HD must accept that his guru position is also not absolute. Thus, by applying HD's own teachings to his own conduct, HD must also accept that it is bona fide for him to also be rejected as a guru!

Further, according to HD's teachings, as the GBC has authorised every guru in ISKCON, then actually every guru in ISKCON can be similarly rejected as being unauthorised. And any other GBC guru who accepts that HD is bona fide, must also accept this conclusion of HD's teachings that they and every other GBC guru can be rejected as being unauthorised.

Conclusion

HD's use of “śāstra” to reject Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings can be used to reject him, and every guru in ISKCON, as being unauthorised *dikṣā* gurus!

From Being *Ṛtvik* to an Illegal Guru

GBC voted-in guru HH Kadamba Kānana Swami (“KKS”) is known in ISKCON for being one of the first “grand-disciple” gurus to start initiating in the physical presence of his guru – GBC voted-in guru HH Jayādvaita Swami (“JAS”). He thus broke the “law of disciplic succession”, which states that only after his guru’s physical disappearance is it even possible for the disciple to initiate:

“during the lifetime of your Spiritual master you bring the prospective disciples to him, and in his absence or disappearance you can accept disciples without any limitation. This is the law of disciplic succession.”

(Śrīla Prabhupāda Letter to Tuṣṭa Kṛṣṇa, 2/12/75)

In a lecture dated 29/4/22, KKS reveals how such law-breaking illegality was engineered, and all quotes in shaded boxes are taken from this lecture. All emphases added.

I was a *ṛtvik*

“He [JAS] said, ‘So, my plan is you can initiate disciples on my behalf’ [...] I said, ‘you mean, *ṛtvik*?’ He says, ‘yes’. I said, ‘But, you know the GBC is never going to approve that’. He says, ‘no, there is no law against it’. [...] the 9th of July letter is the letter which had [sic] written about Śrīla Prabhupāda’s disciples [...] it starts with ‘henceforth’, and then it says that you appoint some people to initiate on his behalf. What did Jayādvaita Swami do? He wrote a letter on the 9th of July, ‘henceforth, to all temple presidents...’”

KKS describes how JAS initially appointed him to act as a *ṛtvik* who would initiate disciples on JAS’s behalf, in exactly the same way that Śrīla Prabhupāda’s *ṛtvik* representatives initiated disciples for Śrīla Prabhupāda – even going to the extent of mimicking Śrīla Prabhupāda’s July 9th letter. Thus, JAS was enthusiastic to institute his own *ṛtvik* system, claiming there “is no law against it”, even though he is completely opposed to Śrīla Prabhupāda’s *ṛtvik* system, although there is also “no law” from Śrīla Prabhupāda against that system continuing after Śrīla Prabhupāda’s physical departure. As we shall see, JAS then went on to hypocritically endorse another system for which there definitely was a law against.

GBC flip flops

“the GBC Chairman, and he came [...] ‘Jayādvaita Swami, Kadamba Kānana Swami, [...] you can’t do this’ [*ṛtvik*], [...] Jayādvaita Mahārāja says, ‘Why not?’ He says, ‘It’s against the law’.”

Mahārāja said, ‘Which law?’ [...] then they had an emergency meeting and then it happened. So, I initiated two people actually in this *ṛtvik* system [...] But then the GBC found that this was too complicated, so they requested us to make it regular.”

KKS reveals more flip flops made by the GBC in relation to the grand-disciple guru issue, whereby he reports that:

1) its chairman first objected to KKS acting as JAS’s *ṛtvik* because it was “against the law”;

2) it then approved KKS acting as JAS’s *ṛtvik*, apparently agreeing that there was no “law” forbidding it;

3) it then again objected to KKS acting as JAS’s *ṛtvik* simply because it was “complicated”, and instead wanted KKS to become a regular *dikṣā* guru. Even though this definitely violated the “law of disciplic succession” quoted at the outset, which the GBC itself had previously vigorously invoked (see last issue’s article “A Movement with No Philosophy”).

Thus, we can observe here at least a triple contradiction.

JAS “cracked” the law!

KKS then boasts about JAS breaking the “law of disciplic succession”:

“So, Jayādvaita Mahārāja literally cracked it open. I don’t know how he did it, but he did it, he really cracked it open, the impossible, the impenetrable wall, he penetrated it. So, somehow or other, here I am, became a spiritual master, in the presence of my spiritual master”

KKS emphasises the illegality of JAS’s action, how with it being a law, to break it should have been “impossible”; an “impenetrable” law. And hence it required JAS to have “literally cracked it open”. Even though JAS himself had also invoked this law when trying to combat Śrīla Prabhupāda’s *ṛtvik* system:

“That a spiritual master initiates until his departure and then his disciples initiate next is the normal system. On this we are all in agreement. This is what Śrīla Prabhupāda taught the entire time he was with us.”

(Where the *Ritvik* People are Wrong, JAS, 1996)

Thus, hypocritically, JAS had only “used” this law to try to stop Śrīla Prabhupāda remaining ISKCON’s *dikṣā* guru.

JAS doesn’t accept

In a lecture, JAS referred to the IRM’s argument that in order to become a successor *dikṣā* guru in ISKCON, one must first have received



Multiple law-breakers: Jayādvaita Swami (L) and Kadamba Kānana Swami

an order to do this from Śrīla Prabhupāda, and JAS claims regarding our demand for such an order that:

“Those who have that idea don’t even know what such an order would look like. Does it have to be a written order? Can it be an oral order?”

(JAS Lecture, 4/5/22)

But this is a false claim. We know exactly what such an order would look like. After July 9th, 1977, every temple president and GBC had been instructed by a movement-wide directive signed by Śrīla Prabhupāda that all initiations would be carried out via the *ṛtvik* system. Clearly, if this system was to be terminated and replaced with successor *dikṣā* gurus, this would require a written comparable counter-directive to be similarly sent to the whole movement. Otherwise, no temple president would know that they should stop following Śrīla Prabhupāda’s *ṛtvik* order, and instead allow these new supposed *dikṣā* gurus to come into their temples and start initiating everyone!

JAS then claims about the IRM that:

“And even when there is a written order to one disciple, ‘you remain, you continue in this way and in the future you’ll be able to initiate disciples of your own’, they don’t accept it”

(JAS Lecture, 4/5/22)

The letter quoted at the outset from Śrīla Prabhupāda to Tuṣṭa Kṛṣṇa Dāsa, explaining the “law of disciplic succession”, is such a letter that JAS refers to here. But the letter does not actually order anyone to replace Śrīla Prabhupāda as ISKCON’s *dikṣā* guru. It only states the time period when it is theoretically possible for such a thing to happen, and we do accept this. But, as we have proven above, it is actually JAS who doesn’t “accept it”, as he has blatantly rejected this law!

Conclusion

We would like to thank KKS for presenting the evidence for the contradictions and hypocrisy of both the GBC and his own guru, JAS.

Śrīla Prabhupāda Is Not a Liar

In our book *Śrīla Prabhupāda: The Founder-Acārya of ISKCON – Presenting the Conclusions of the GBC Foundational Document*, we showed how, by quoting both the GBC and Śrīla Prabhupāda, Śrīla Prabhupāda's status as the *Ācārya* of ISKCON establishes that he will always be ISKCON's sole *dikṣā* guru. This stunning conclusion has led to the use of desperate cheating tactics to try to counter the fact that Śrīla Prabhupāda is the *Ācārya* of ISKCON, and hence also its *dikṣā* guru. Thus, GBC voted-in guru **HH Bhakti Vikāsa Swami ("BVKS")**:

1) First tried blatantly lying by claiming that:

"Prabhupāda didn't call himself the Founder and *Ācārya*" (BVKS Lecture, 24/3/20)

a) This lie was easily exposed by us in BTP 66 by simply quoting Śrīla Prabhupāda calling himself the "Founder and *Ācārya*"!

b) Given this humiliating exposé, BVKS has now had to correct himself and state that:

"Śrīla Prabhupāda did use this term, 'Founder and *Ācārya*'" (BVKS Lecture, 26/2/22)

Śrīla Prabhupāda used this term in official situations such as opening bank accounts where he was required to *explain* his actual position in ISKCON for the record. Thus, this proves that "Founder and *Ācārya*" was simply the explanation of what the "Founder-*Ācārya*" title meant.

2) BVKS now claims that:

"'Founder hyphen *Ācārya*', which means they are going to be other *ācāryas* of ISKCON [...] If you say 'Founder and *Ācārya*' that means no more *ācāryas*." (BVKS Lecture, 26/2/22)

a) BVKS is claiming that "Founder-*Ācārya*" means the opposite of "Founder and *Ācārya*" since the former means there will be more *ācāryas*, but the latter means that there will be no more *ācāryas*.

b) Since BVKS has already admitted that Śrīla Prabhupāda *did* use the term "Founder and *Ācārya*", BVKS is claiming that by using both "Founder and *Ācārya*" and "Founder-*Ācārya*" at the same time, Śrīla Prabhupāda described his position in ISKCON as meaning two contradictory things. Which would mean that, according to BVKS, Śrīla Prabhupāda was either lying when he said he was "Founder and *Ācārya*" of ISKCON, or lying when he said he was "Founder-*Ācārya*", which BVKS claims does **not** mean "Founder and *Ācārya*". Thus, having first been exposed as lying himself about Śrīla Prabhupāda using the term "Founder and *Ācārya*", as documented in point 1) above, BVKS is now asserting that Śrīla Prabhupāda must be a liar who contradicted himself.

3) BVKS claims in the same lecture that Śrīla Prabhupāda:

"didn't stress – as the *rtvik-vādis* claim, they just change it a little bit – 'Founder and *Ācārya*', which changes the meaning"

a) BVKS is lying again. The IRM (who BVKS calls "*rtvik-vādis*") does not claim that Śrīla Prabhupāda did "stress" the "Founder and *Ācārya*" term. We have simply stated the fact, as admitted now by BVKS, that Śrīla Prabhupāda did use "Founder and *Ācārya*", and that it was used by Śrīla Prabhupāda to explain his position in ISKCON as explained in point 1) above. Hence, saying "Founder and *Ācārya*", as Śrīla Prabhupāda did, does *not* change the meaning of "Founder-*Ācārya*" as BVKS claims, but rather it **explains** the meaning of "Founder-*Ācārya*".

b) Thus, BVKS is also lying when he claims that we "change it", meaning that we changed "Founder-*Ācārya*" to "Founder and *Ācārya*". We did *not* change it, since it was Śrīla Prabhupāda who used the "Founder and *Ācārya*" term, and we have simply pointed this fact out.

4) Thus, BVKS's whole argument is that:

a) Śrīla Prabhupāda used two different titles at the same time which meant opposite things to describe his position in ISKCON. Which means that Śrīla Prabhupāda must be a liar who contradicted himself.


b) However, BVKS's argument fails simply because Śrīla Prabhupāda is *not* a liar who contradicts himself. Rather, he is the bona fide spiritual master and *Ācārya* of ISKCON. That BVKS would engage in such an offensive attack on Śrīla Prabhupāda is not surprising. We already exposed him in the last issue making a similarly offensive "**Psycho**" attack on Śrīla Prabhupāda, where he compared Śrīla Prabhupāda to a **rotting corpse** from an Alfred Hitchcock film. He did this in his desperation to try to show that Śrīla Prabhupāda cannot continue to be the *dikṣā* guru of ISKCON. Similarly, the same desperation has now resulted in BVKS attacking Śrīla Prabhupāda as a liar, because if Śrīla Prabhupāda remains the *Ācārya* of ISKCON, then, as we stated at the outset, this means he also remains ISKCON's *dikṣā* guru, and BVKS will lose his cushy position as a *dikṣā* guru.

KNOW THE TRUTH

To receive a **FREE** copy, please:

- email us at: irm@iskconirm.com
- or fill out the enclosed reply card
- or write to our address given on page 2

Want to receive BTP, but don't want anyone to see or know? Then ask for your subscription to be sent in a plain, unmarked envelope. This confidential service is offered free of charge. Simply let us know. And tell potential subscribers about this service too.



THE BOOK THAT HAS THE GURUS ON THE RUN!

"*The Final Order* by Krishnakant Desai has been perhaps the most influential post-1977 publication in the Vaiṣṇava world."

- HH Bhakti Vikāsa Swami, ISKCON guru

With Foreword by Professor Kim Knott, Head of Religious Studies, Leeds University, UK